## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

United States of America,	) Case No. CR 18-184 SK
Plaintiff,	STIPULATED ORDER EXCLUDING TIME UNDER THE SPEEDY TRIAL
Chappell and Reggans  Defendant.	JUL 3 0 2018
Defendant.	SUSAN Y. SOONG CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT CLERK, DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
time under the Speedy Trial Act from Jul finds that the ends of justice served by the c	continuance outweigh the best interest of the public U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A). The Court makes this
Failure to grant a continuance See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(i).	ee would be likely to result in a miscarriage of justice.
number of defendants, the national novel questions of fact or law, that it	complex, due to [check applicable reasons] the ure of the prosecution, or the existence of is unreasonable to expect adequate preparation for within the time limits established by this section. See
	the would deny the defendant reasonable time to obtain the exercise of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. §
Failure to grant a continuance of counsel, given counsel's other sch exercise of due diligence. <i>See</i> 18 U.S.	the would unreasonably deny the defendant continuity deduled case commitments, taking into account the S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).
Failure to grant a continuance reasonable time necessary for effective diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)	the would unreasonably deny the defendant the ve preparation, taking into account the exercise of due 7)(B)(iv).
IT IS SO ORDERED.	
DATED: 7-20-8	SALLIE KIM United States Magistrate Judge
STIPULATED: Attorney for Defendant	Assistant United States Attorney